DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 430 400 FL 025 836

AUTHOR Suh, Jae-Suk
TITLE ESL Korean Learners' Use of External and Internal Modifications in Request Realizations.
PUB DATE 1999-00-00
NOTE 40p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Comparative Analysis; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Korean; Language Patterns; Language Usage; *Native Speakers; *Pragmatics; Second Language Learning
IDENTIFIERS *Politeness; *Requests

ABSTRACT

A study investigated how Korean learners of English as a second language (ESL) differ from native speakers of English in the use of supportive moves and in the expression of politeness (use of downgraders) in requests, a speech act considered to be face-threatening. Three groups of subjects participated: 30 Korean students enrolled in an intensive university ESL program; 30 native English-speaking American university students; and 30 Korean students in a Korean university, who served as a control group for the Korean subjects. Each group was administered a discourse completion test, in which they were asked to read the descriptions of 12 situations and write down what they would say in each situation. The request realizations by the Korean ESL students were compared with those of the English native speakers in terms of supportive moves and downgraders. Analysis of the results is presented. They indicate that patterns of the ESL learners differed greatly from those of native speakers of both English and Korean, suggesting not transfer of skills from language to language but some idiosyncrasies. Explanations and pedagogical implications are considered. The discourse completion tasks are appended. Contains 41 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 430 400

1. Title of Article: "ESL Korean learners' use of external and internal modifications in request realizations"

2. Name of Author: Jae-Suk Suh

3. Address: Jae-Suk Suh

Mokdong APT #113 – 108, Yangcheon Gu, Seoul, Korea 158 – 056

4. Telephone number: (02) 646 – 9722

5. E – mail address: jsuhs@kuccnx.korea.ac.kr

6. About the author: Jae-Suk Suh obtained his Ph.D. in Foreign Language Education from Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, in 1998. His area of interest includes interlanguage pragmatics, second/foreign language reading, and authentic assessment. He is currently teaching at Korea University as a part-time instructor.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jae-Suk Suh
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

FL025836

1. Introduction

Interlanguage pragmatics is the area of studying L2 learners' pragmatic knowledge. Due in part to the influential and famous work on speech act theory by language philosophers such as Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), the notion of speech acts has been considered one essential element of pragmatic competence and stimulated numerous studies in second language research. Since the ways speech acts are performed under similar situations may differ across languages and cultures, which can be the cause of cross-cultural communication breakdown, L2 researchers, through systematic investigations of the comparison of native and non-native speakers' speech act behaviors, attempted to identify pragmatic deviations from target language norms in order to help non-native speakers to learn to perform speech acts appropriately.

Speech acts which have been examined in second language research to date include, among others, requests (e.g., Blum-Kulka & Levenston, 1987), apologies (e.g., Cohen, Olshtain & Rosenstein, 1986), refusals (e.g., Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford, 1991), compliments (e.g., Wolfson, 1989b), complaints (e.g., Olshtain & Weinbach, 1987) and expressions of gratitude (e.g., Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986). The overall findings of the studies have consistently showed that learners, even those who attain high grammatical proficiency, differ from native speakers of a target language in the use of strategies for a given speech act, and are pragmatically deficient. This suggests that for most learners, it is a complicated, formidable task to achieve pragmatic competence to the same extent that they can control over grammatical rules and structures in L2.

Among the speech acts investigated, requests received considerable attention both since they are frequently used in everyday communication for gaining information, help, or cooperation from others in general and since they are extremely important to L2 learners in particular in the sense that the majority of their interaction with target language speakers takes place in the form of requests (Koike, 1989). Studies of interlanguage requests shed light on three learner-specific performance features: transfer of L1 pragmatic knowledge, tendency to make requests longer, and limitedness in range of politeness strategies. The transfer of L1 sociolinguistic norms into L2 speech act performance (i.e., pragmatic transfer) is considered more important than transfer at the sentence level (i.e., syntactic, phonological or semantic level) since L1 transfer at the pragmatic level may result in miscommunication and even break down conversation (Kasper, 1992).

The tendency of L2 learners to make their requests longer than target language speakers has been referred to as waffle phenomenon (Edmondson & House, 1991). They talk too much by adding a variety of supportive moves to requestive utterances (e.g., Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986; Rintell & Mitchell, 1989; House & Kasper, 1987). When the waffling occurs, learners provide more information than needed for the act of request, and some of it may be seen as irrelevant or redundant by hearer. Such verbosity can lead to pragmatic failure with the violation of the English native speakers conversational rules like Cooperative Principles suggested by Grice (1975) (i.e., Do not provide more

information than required, Be brief and clear). The present study looked at request realizations by ESL Korean learners and examined how their requests become longer in various situations, as compared to native speakers of English.

The speech act of requests is considered face-threatening (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Since requests get a hearer to do something which is beneficial to a speaker, but costly to a hearer, they put imposition on the hearer and threaten his/her freedom to act without being interrupted by others (i.e., negative face). Hence, to save hearer's face wants and maintain a good relationship with the hearer, a speaker needs to make the request sound polite and less imposing through politeness strategies or mitigating devices. Studies of politeness in requests by non-native speakers of English examined either their perception of politeness levels of various request forms, or their production of politeness strategies in different contexts (e.g., Walters, 1980; Tanaka & Kawade, 1982; Fukushima & Iwata, 1985; Kitao, 1990). Though no significant difference was found between native and non-native speakers in the perception of politeness, non-native speakers showed limitations in the range of politeness strategies and inability to use them according to various contextual variables. Despite many studies of L2 learners' use of politeness strategies, few of them systematically investigated how learners modify request utterances internally to attain level of politeness appropriate to a particular situation and simultaneously reduce the imposition created by requests. So this study examined ESLKorean learners' politeness behaviors by focusing on the use of internal modification (i.e., downgraders) under a variety of situations.

In light of the fact that requests are face-threatening acts, and that the use of politeness strategies is affected by various factors, it would not be an easy task for L2 learners to perform requests in linguistically, socially and culturally appropriate manners. They should not only have sufficient linguistic resources to encode a request, but also know sociocultural rules involving in the choice of politeness strategies in a particular situation with taking into account a variety of social and contextual factors. Particularly for Korean learners of English, it would be more difficult to successfully perform requests since their native language differs greatly from English both linguistically and culturally. The Korean language has a complex and sophisticated system of honorifics to mark deference as well as an independent linguistic system to encode politeness (Hwang, 1990), as compared to English which relies on directness level, modals, moods and a variety of syntactic, phrasal and lexical mitigators to express politeness in request realizations. Also there are differences in cultural norms involved in social structure, which may affect sociopragmatic perceptions of contextual factors in the performance of requests: Korea has been a vertical and hierarchical society with great emphasis placed on power (Shinn, 1990, p. 13) whereas American society is horizontal and highly values individual autonomy and privacy. So given these linguistic and cultural differences between the two languages, it would be interesting to examine whether ESL Korean learners can realize requests and use politeness strategies in various situations in a way similar to English native speakers. To be more specific, the present study attempted to find the answers to the following questions:

1. How do ESL Korean learners differ from native speakers of English in the use of supportive moves in requests?
2. How do ESL Korean learners differ from native speakers of English in the expression of politeness in requests? In other words, do they differ from English native speakers in the use of internal modification (i.e., downgraders)?

In order to answer these questions, a study was conducted in which three groups of subjects participated: ESL Korean learners as non-native speakers for L2, English, native speakers of English as informants for L2 (L2 control group), and native speakers of Korean as informants for L1 (L1 control group). The native Korean-speaking group served to establish L1 baseline data and determine the influence of the first language on the request realizations produced by Korean learners ofESL. In gathering data, a discourse completion test (DCT) was used to elicit the speech act of requests. The DCT included twelve situations developed on the basis of a combination of two contextual factors: social power and familiarity. The three groups of subjects were asked to read the description of each situation and write down what they would say in a given situation. Then request realizations by Korean learners of ESL were compared with those of English native speakers in terms of supportive moves and downgraders.

2. Methods

1) Subjects

The subjects of the study consisted of three groups: a group of Korean learners learning English as a second language (ESL), a group of native speakers of American English, and a group of native speakers of Korean. A first group of Korean learners of ESLserved as informants for L2 interlanguage and was made up of 30 Korean students (15 males and 15 females) enrolled at Intensive English Program (IEP) in Indiana University. The Intensive English Program of IU aims at helping non-native speakers to improve English language skills needed for achieving their academic or vocational goals (CELT, 1994). There are seven proficiency levels in the program (i.e., level 1 and 2 = beginning level, level 3, 4, and 5 = intermediate level, and level 6 and 7 = advanced level).

According to background information obtained before data collection, among the 30 Korean learners, twelve were from level 5 while thirteen came from level 6. Also five were from level 7. So all learners were in either upper-intermediate or advanced proficiency level in IEP. It was thought that since the learners were in relatively high proficiency level, they would be able to write down what they would say in a DCT, as compared to low-proficiency learners who would not. The learners ranged in age from 20 to 29 years. Before coming to the US, they had been college or university students (3 freshmen, 4 sophomores, 5 juniors, 8 seniors and 10 graduate students) in their home country, which means that they had been studying English for more than 7 years (i.e., 6 years in middle and high school, and 1 year in college). They had majored in various fields such as mass communication, business, music,

administration, and management among others. An informal interview with the individual learners conducted before data collection showed that nearly all of them had been familiar with the term pragmatics and discourse completion tasks (DCTs) since they had been introduced into pragmatics in their IEP classes in which they had had many opportunities to perform various speech acts through completing DCTs.

A second group, native speakers of English, served as informants for L2, English (i.e., L2 control group to establish L2 baseline data). The subjects in this group were 30 American students (15 males and 15 females) studying in Indiana University. Twenty six were undergraduate (5 freshmen, 9 sophomores, 8 juniors and 4 seniors) while the rest were graduate students. They were enrolled in a variety of dep_rtments: accounting, chemistry, business, law, psychology, journalism, education, biology, nursing and among others. They ranged in age from 18 to 29 years.

A thi d group, native speakers of Korean, served as informants for L1, Korean (i.e., L1 control group to establish L1 baseline data). This group was made up of 30 Korean students (15 males and 15 females) enrolled in one of the universities in Korea. They ranged in age from 20 to 29 years. Twenty five were undergraduate (16 sophomores, 7 juniors and 2 seniors), and five were graduate students. They majored in either Korean language and literature, or Korean education.

All subjects in the three groups were informed that their participation in the study was voluntary. In order to encourage participation in the study, selected subjects were paid a fee of $ 4. One great advantage of choosing university-level students as the subjects across all three groups is that the researcher was able to attain a high level of homogeneity in such variables as educational background, occupation, and age (Blum Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989). However, a disadvantage is that college-level students are just one part of the entire population of each language group and cannot be representative of it.

2) Instruments and Procedures

In gathering the data, a discourse completion task (DCT) was used. The DCT was an open-ended, written questionnaire to elicit the speech act of requests. The main reason for choosing the DCT lies in Eisenstein & Bodman's (1986) argument that DCTs provide subjects (particularly non-native speakers) with a good opportunity to respond well. According to them, non-native speakers tend to feel nervous and uncomfortable during a face-to-face conversation or oral exam in which they feel pressure, and as a result, they may not be able to show their linguistic and pragmatic knowledge fully in such situations. However, in written questionnaires like DCTs, they are provided with sufficient time to plan and make their best response to a given situation. So if they are not able to use knowledge about speech acts in unpressured situations such as DCTs, they are not likely to perform better or more effectively in face-to-face interactions. Therefore, the DCT was thought to be an appropriate measure of their best knowledge. In addition, even though informants' responses to DCTs do not adequately reflect actual

speech behaviors and represent interactive features (e.g., tone, prosodic, depth of emotion, repetition and negotiation) occurring in natural conversation, it has been shown that DCTs allow researchers to look into stereotypical semantic formulas and strategies for a given speech act that seem to appear in natural speech (Beebe & Cummings, 1996; Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper, 1989; Beebe & Takahashi, 1989).

The DCT included twelve situations developed on the basis of a combination of two variables, i.e., familiarity and social power. Familiarity has two values, + and -: + familiarity means that interlocutors have known each other, and - familiarity indicates that they do not know each other. Social power has three values, +, 0 and - : + social power means a situation where the speaker has more social power than the hearer (speaker dominance), and - social power refers to a situation where the hearer has more power than the speaker (hearer dominance). 0 social power represents a situation where the speaker and hearer are equal in social power. A systematic combination of two values of familiarity with three values of social power yielded six categories: (+ familiarity, + social power), (+ familiarity, 0 social power), (+ familiarity, - social power), (- familiarity, + social power), (- familiarity, 0 social power) and (- familiarity, - social power). Each category contained two different situations, which resulted in twelve situations. Role relationships between a speaker and a hearer in terms of the two variables in twelve situations are attached to the Appendix A.

Regarding content of situations, an effort was made to develop scenarios which the subjects of the study (i.e., the student population) were familiar with, and which they might have reacted to before. As the main reason, if they are not familiar with scenarios, they may be forced to produce unnatural speech act behavior, which affects the overall results of the study (Cohen & Olshtain, 1994). However, one limitation is that since the scenarios are most likely to occur in a college or university setting, they cannot represent a variety of settings that take place in everyday life. Among the twelve scenarios, two were taken from Blum Kulka, House & Kasper (1989) and five from Mir-Fernandez (1994) though some revisions were made to the originals to create more specific context.

The DCT was refined through a pilot study in which it was administered to three Korean learners of ESL and three native speakers of English. On the basis of suggestions and comments by both groups, the DCT was modified. Two different versions of the DCT were developed. An English version of the DCT was given to the Korean learners of ESL and the native speakers of English while a Korean version of the DCT was offered the native Korean-speaking group. In order to establish cross-cultural equivalence between the two versions of the DCT, the Korean version was developed through back translation (Brislin, Lonner & Thorndike, 1973). That is, an English version of the DCT was translated into Korean by the researcher, which was translated back into English by an assistant researcher. Then, two English versions of the DCT were compared to each other to see if there was any difference. In the DCT, the subjects in three groups were asked to read the description of a situation and write down what they would be most likely to say in a given situation. ESL Korean learners and English native speakers were instructed to realize their requests in English, and Korean native speakers in Korean. All subjects

were informed that they could spend as much time as they wanted. One of the twelve situations in the DCT is presented below as an example, and the rest are attached to the Appendix B.

Situation 5)
As a part-time job, you are working as a library monitor. While checking on each floor in the library, you see a group of students that you don't know talking loudly in a non-discussion area. It seems clear that this loud noise disturbs other students ' studying. You want those students to be quiet or move to a discussion area. You approach them. What would you say?

3) Data analysis

In order to analyze written data from the DCT, it was necessary to determine what a unit of analysis should be. Since subjects (Korean learners of ESL, native speakers of English and native speakers of Korean) provided written responses to each one of the twelve situations in the DCT, any response which an individual subject produced to make a request in a given situation was considered to be a unit of analysis. Further to code written responses as request sequences, a coding scheme was used which had been developed by Blum-Kulka, House & Kasper (1989) in the CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Patterns) project. As Cohen & Olshtain (1994) suggest, Blum-Kulka et. al's coding scheme was thought to be appropriate for examining language learners' speech act knowledge, since it has been widely used in a number of speech act studies.

According to the coding scheme, a request sequence consists of a head act and other parts such as alerters, supportive moves and downgraders which are optional for realizing a request. A head act is the core of a request sequence since it realizes a request independently of other parts. That is, a head act is a request strategy chosen by a speaker in a specific context to perform a request. So the first step in analyzing DCT data was to identify a head act from a written response to each one of the twelve situations. Once head acts were identified, supportive moves were coded. Supportive moves are used to mitigate or aggravate impositive force of a request. They are located outside a head act and occur either before or after it. Supportive moves were divided into two main categories: mitigating and aggravating. The former had six subcategories (preparator, precommitment, grounder, disarmer, promise of reward, and imposition minimizer) and the latter included three subcategories (insult, threat, and moralizing). Since Blum-Kulka et. al's coding scheme did not cover all supportive moves found in this study, some subcategories (i.e., acknowledgement of imposition, concern, and appreciation) were taken from Mir-Fernandez (1994) while several subcategories (i.e., rhetorical question, promise of nonrecurrence, willingness, and seriousness and urgency) were developed during classification. Definition and examples of supportive moves used for classification are given in Table 1 and 2.

Table 1. Mitigating Supportive Moves

Type of moves	Definition	Example
Preparator	The speaker prepares his or her hearer for the ensuing request by announcing that he or she will make a request by asking about the potential availability of the hearer for carrying out the request, by asking for the hearer permission to make the request, or by stating a problem or needs leading to a request	*"I'm having a major crisis over here!* Can I use your computer tonight?" *"I have a favor to ask.* Do you think I could borrow this article?" *"I have gotten myself in a big jam.* The book I needed for the paper has been checked out already" *"I just wanted to talk to you about the paper that is due tomorrow.* I have had so many problems with it"
Precommitment	The speaker checks on a potential refusal before making a request by trying to commit his/her hearer	*"Will you be using your computer tonight?* I really need your help" *"Are you by chance using your computer tomorrow?* Well I was just wondering if you cared if I used it"
Grounder	The speaker gives reasons, explanations, or justifications for his/her request, which may either precede or follow it	*"The book we need for the assignment is checked out.* May I borrow your copy please?" "Could you please let some of the students waiting have a turn *since you are just playing games?"*
Disarmer	The speaker tries to remove any potential objections the hearer might raise upon being confront-ed with the request	*"You seem to know what's going on in here.* Would you like to get together and study for the test?" "I was wondering if you want to study for the upcoming test. *I know you are smart"*
Promise of reward	The speaker gives a reward to increase the likelihood of the hearer compliance with the request	"Could you please stay late today since we are so busy? *I will pay you overtime"* "Would you like to stick around for another hour? *Extra money"*
Imposition minimizer	The speaker tries to reduce the imposition created by the request	"Would you mind if I borrow your article? *I'll return it as soon as I can"* "Can I borrow yours (computer) if you e not using it? *I'll pay for the paper"*
Acknowledgment of imposition	The speaker acknowledges the imposition created by a requested action by apologizing, referring to a situation involved in the request, or providing a moral statement	I was wondering if you might have a copy of this book that I could borrow. *Sorry about the inconvenience"* *"I don't want to be rude,* but there are a lot of students studying and you e sort of talking loud so would you mind being a little bit more quiet?"
Concern	The speaker shows concern about the hearer ability, willingness, or availability to carry out the request	*"if you don't mind", "if you have time", "if it is ok to you"*
Appreciation	The speaker expresses his/her appreciation for the hearer compliance with the request before it is performed	*"I appreciate you (it)", "Thank you", "Thanks"*

cf) Examples were taken from the data.

Table 2. Aggravating Supportive Moves

Type of moves	Definition	Example
Threat	The speaker threatens the hearer to ensure compliance with the request with potential con-sequences arising out of non-compliance with the request	*"If you can't do (it), I should hire one more clerk"*
Moralizing	The speaker refers to the positive outcomes of the request to ensure compliance with the request	*"If you give me an extension on paper due, I may do the most thorough job possible" "It would really help me out"*
Rhetorical question	The speaker asks a question in which h/she is not interested in an answer but in criticizing, blaming the hearer, or stating the problem involving the act	*"What are you doing here? "Do you know how fast you were going?"*

Promise of non- recurrence	The speaker promises not to make the same request to the hearer to ensure the hearer compliance	*"I promise I won't make (any) problems like this from now on"*
Willingness	The speaker expresses his/her willingness to do his/her best with regard to the act involved to ensure the hearer compliance	*"I will stay up all night to finish it if I have to"*
Seriousness/Urgency	The speaker expresses the seriousness or urgency of the act requested to increase the likeli-hood of the hearer compliance with the act	*"A serious thing would happen" "The matter is urgent"*

According to the above classification, supportive moves used by three language groups were coded and further compared in terms of types and frequencies of supportive moves. It should be noted that the coding was not always clear-cut. That is, there were some moves which could belong to two different subtypes. In such cases, an assistant researcher was asked to classify those moves by herself, and her classification was compared with the researcher's. If there was a difference between the two, they read through definitions of moves concerned and discussed the difference to reach an agreement.

The next step of analyzing data was taken to examine the differences between English native speakers and ESL Korean learners in the expression of politeness in requests. In spite of a number of views and definitions of politeness in the literature (Lakoff, 1973; Leech, 1983; Brown & Levinson, 1987; Fraser, 1990; Meier, 1997), there has been no consensus among researchers as to what politeness is about. However, in light of the fact that, among elements involved in request realizations, downgraders make a great contribution to politeness in a given request strategy, this study viewed politeness in requests as a function of downgraders. Downgraders, unlike supportive moves, modify a request strategy internally. They mitigate the impositive force of a request through syntactic, lexical or phrasal choices. According to House & Kasper (1981), downgraders are "markers which play down the impact X utterance is likely to have on Y" (p. 166). So they play a significant role in making a given strategy polite, therefore saving the hearer's face. Different degrees of politeness can be achieved according to presence or absence of downgraders and number of downgraders present in a strategy (House & Kasper, 1981). For the classification of downgraders in the study, Blum-Kulka et. al's (1989) and House & Kasper's (1981, 1987) coding scheme were used. Table 3 shows definition and examples of each category of downgraders used for the analysis:

Table 3. The classification of downgraders

Category of downgraders	Definition	Example
Politeness marker	An optional element added to an act to show deference to the hearer and to bid for cooperative behavior	please, do you think "*Please* wrap it up now", "Go home, *please*" "*Do you think* I could borrow this article?"
Play-down	Syntactic devices used to tone down the perlocutionary effect an utterance is likely to have on the hearer	past tense with present time reference, durative aspect mark-er, negation "I wanted to see if I could maybe turn it in a little late" "I *was wondering* if the music could be turned down"

Consultative device	Optional devices such as routines and ritualized formulas consulting explicitly the hearer opinion, or by means of which the speaker seeks to involve the hearer and bid for his/her cooperation	would you mind if .., would you mind v-ing "*Would you mind if* I borrowed your article?" "*Would you mind keeping* the noise level to a minimum?
Understater	Adverbial modifiers by means of which the speaker under-represents the state of affairs denoted in the proposition	a little bit, a second, not very much, just a trifle "Do you think you could turn down your music *a little bit*?"
Downtoner	Sentence modifiers which are used by the speaker in order to reduce the impositive force of his/her request	just, possibly, maybe, simply, perhaps, rather "I was *just* wondering if you cared if I used it" "Could you *possibly* turn your music down?"
Subjectivizer	Elements in which the speaker explicitly expresses his/her subjective opinion vis vis the state of affairs referred to in the proposition, thus lowering the assertive force of the request	I think, I believe, I suppose, I am afraid, in my opinion "*I think* you should give other students your computer" "*I think* it too loud to do my stuff"
Agent avoider	Syntactic devices by means of which it is possible for the speaker not to mention either him/herself or the hearer as agents, thus, for instance, avoiding direct attack	passive, impersonal constructions using people, they, one, you as neutral agents lacking [+do-finite] and [+specific] reference "*Would it be possible* for you to maybe quiet down a little or talk somewhere else?"

3. Results and Discussion

1) Supportive moves

Table 4-1. Frequency of Supportive moves in Situation 1 (raw scores)

	Precommit-ment	Rhetorical question	Ground-er	Dis-armer	Imposition Minimizer	Acknowledgement of Imposition	Concern	No Use	Total
KESL	2	10	26	9	0	14	1	0	62
ENS	0	0	25	8	2	2	1	1	39
KNS	0	8	25	8	4	4	0	1	50

cf) KESL: Korean Learners of ESL, ENS: English Native Speakers, KNS: Korean Native Speakers

Situation 1)

As a part-time job, you are working as a computer assistant in a computer lab. It is the end of the semester, and there are many students waiting for their turn to use computers. While consulting one student 's problems, you see your classmate playing games excitedly. Academic use always precedes non-ac.. .ic use in a computer lab. You approach him/her. What would you say?

According to Table 4-1, the subcategory of grounder, which offers reasons, explanations, or justifications for a request, was the most frequently used supportive move in three language groups. Most of the English native speakers tended to realize their requests with a head act preceded or followed by grounder while others added to this sequence the disarmer, which removes any potential objections the hearer may raise upon being confronted with the request. The following are some examples:

"Could you please let some of the students waiting have a turn *since you are just playing games?* " (ENS #1)
"Excuse me, there are others waiting in line, so if you wouldn't mind, *if you are just playing games*, could you please let someone else use this computer? " (ENS #6)
"Excuse me, but you are wasting what could be valuable time for other students. *University computers are used for*

school work only, so I'm going to have to ask you to close up and give someone else a turn." (ENS #14)
"Excuse me, *academic use precedes games when other are waiting*. Please wrap it up now" (ENS #22)

Overall, the Korean native speakers used supportive moves in a way similar to the native speakers of English though they showed a little higher preference for such moves as imposition minimizer, reducing the level of imposition created by the act, and acknowledgement of imposition, describing the speaker's acknowledgement of the imposition. One thing to note is that 8 out of the 30 Korean native speakers used rhetorical questions in which they were not interested in an answer but in criticizing the hearer, or stating the problem involved in the act. As a possible explanation, they might have thought that the use of rhetorical questions helped them to make the interlocutor know the problem clearly before making head acts:

"Look over there! *Are you playing games in front of many students waiting?* Get out!" (KNS #4)
"*What are you doing playing games here?* Do it when the room is not crowded" (KNS #9)
"Sorry b . .ook at those students waiting for their turn. *What do they say about your playing games?* Yield your seat to them and play games later!" (KNS #18)

The Korean learners of ESL employed more supportive moves than the two native speaker groups (i.e., number of total moves: 62 in the KESL, 39 in the ENS and 50 in the KNS). Grounder was employed most often while acknowledgement of imposition was the second most preferred choice. Also rhetorical questions were preferred. Since the native speakers of Korean were found to use rhetorical questions, the learners' preference for them may have been influenced by their L1 pragmatic knowledge. Here are examples:

"*What are you doing here?* Did you finish your work already? Look at the students waiting for their turn. Please play game in your house" (KESL #1)
"Hey man! *What are you doing here?* Can't you see people wait?" (KESL #15)
"Hey! *What are you doing now?* It looks fun but look here are many students. So I'm sorry but can you get out here?" (KESL #26)

Table 4-2. Frequency of Supportive moves in Situation 2 (raw scores)

	Prepar ator	Pre commit ment	Gr oun der	Dis- armer	Promise of Reward	Imposition Minimizer	Acknowledge- ment of Im position	Appr ec. t ion	Con- cern	No Use	Total
KESL	8	6	34	6	2	4	4	2	3	1	70
ENS	0	0	30	0	0	4	6	10	0	3	53
KNS	0	0	27	0	11	8	8	2	0	3	59

Situation 2)
You are taking a course. Last week you missed a few classes since you had a bad cold. A mid-term exam is scheduled to be held next week. You know that one of the classmates attends classes regularly and takes good notes. You want to borrow his/her notebook. You approach him/her. What would you say?

The native speakers of English used grounder as the most preferred choice of supportive move while they employed appreciation the second most frequently. Before or after making head acts, they tended to provide reasons or explanations for borrowing a notebook from a classmate and complete realizing a request with appreciation. The following are some examples of showing this tendency:

"*I missed class a couple times last week* and I would really appreciate it if I could photo copy your notes. *Thank you*" (ENS #2)
"I was wondering if I could borrow your lecture notes, *I was sick last week and missed classes*. I promise to have them back to you tomorrow. *Thanks a lot*" (ENS #9)
"Do you mind if I borrow your notes from last week. *I was sick. I would really appreciate it. Thanks* " (ENS #25)

Some of the English native speakers used imposition minimizer (e.g., "I will make any necessary arrangements to return them to you", "I will give them right back to you", "I promise to have them back to you tomorrow"), while others employed acknowledgement of imposition (e.g., "I feel terrible asking", "I am really sorry", "I am sorry to bother you").

Like the English native speakers, the Korean native speakers showed a strong preference for grounder and used it most often. As the second most frequent supportive move, as compared to the English native speakers who provided the appreciation for lending a notebook, the Korean native speakers tended to choose promise of reward. In doing so, most of them offered something to eat, i.e., buying a meal, or a delicious food. The following are examples:

"I didn't attend classes because I was sick. I will copy your note and give it back. Please lend it to me . *I will buy a meal for you*" (KNS #2)
"I'm sorry but will you lend me your note? *I will buy a lunch*" (KNS #10)
"I missed classes because of a cold. We have a test next week, and I don 't have a good notetaking. Will you lend me a notebook? *I'll buy something delicious for you*" (KNS #24)

Such a tendency of the Korean native speakers to provide the interlocutor with something to eat in return of help (lending a notebook) can be explained by a Korean custom that when a person receives benefits or kindness from another, he/she has to repay it. And it is customary to see a student who owes a debt of gratitude buying food (lunch) for a fellow student in a Korean university campus.

Unlike the native speakers of both English and Korean, the ESL Korean learners used all nine subcategories of supportive moves. They outnumbered the other two groups in the total use of moves (70 in the KESL, 53 in the ENS and 59 in the KNS). It is unlikely that such verbosity on the part of the learners resulted from L1 influence since the Korean native speakers did not overuse supportive moves. One clear example showing the learners' verbosity is that, as seen from Table 4-2, they employed 20 moves, i.e., 8 in preparatory, 6 in precommitment and 6 in disarmer, whereas the two native speaker groups did not use any one of these subcategories:

"Hi, how are you? *Could you do me a favor? I need your help*. Actually, I missed a few classes last week as you know. Please show me your notes" (KESL #1)
"*Would you do me a favor?* I missed a few classes because of a bad cold, so I will be very happy if you lend me your note. *I know you are an excellent student*" (KESL #2)
"Hi, *would you do me a favor? I need your help*. As you know, I missed classes so I can prepare for the exam. Could you lend your note?" (KESL #17)

Further, there were several cases in which the learners used supportive movesinappropriately. For instance, though the purpose of the subcategory of precommitment is to check on a potential refusal

before making a head act, one Korean learner used it after the head act as in"Hi! I need your help, sincerely. I didn't take a note because of a cold. *Do you do me a favor?*" (KESL #13). In addition, the learners employed the subcategory of appreciation infrequently in comparison with the English native speakers (2 in the KESL and 10 in the ENS). Such an underuse of the appreciation is likely to make the learners appear insincere and less likely to get full cooperation from the interlocutor (a classmate).

Table 4-3. Frequency of Supportive moves in Situation 3 (raw scores)

	Preparator	Pre-commitment	Grounder	Willingness	Moralizing	Imposition Minimizer	Acknowledgement of Imposition	Appreciation	Promise of nonrecurrence	No Use	Total
KESL	16	4	36	0	2	3	13	4	1	0	79
ENS	3	2	29	1	6	3	9	5	0	1	59
KNS	1	0	25	0	8	4	7	0	1	2	48

Situation 3)

Tomorrow is the due date of a final term paper for one of the courses you take this semester. However, you are not able to turn it in on time. You want to talk to the professor, whom you have known for a couple of years, and ask him/her to give you an extension on the paper. You go to his/her office and knock on the door. What would you say?

As shown in Table 4-3, the native speakers of English used the subcategory of grounder most frequently and, as the second most preferred choice, employed acknowledgement of imposition. Also the subcategory of moralizing, which refers to the positive outcome of the act requested, was used often to increase the possibility of the hearer's compliance:

> "Hello, I am terribly sorry to have bothered you. The paper due tomorrow is very important and I feel that I am doing a good job on it. However, I would like to have an extension, so that *I may do the most thorough job possible*" (ENS #10)
> "Hello, sir? I just wanted to talk to you about the paper that is due tomorrow. I have had so many problems with it and I won't be finished by tomorrow. Would there be any way I could get an extension? I understand if you can't but I would really appreciate if you could. *My final paper that I turn in will be incredible* " (ENS #15)

Similarly, the native speakers of Korean showed a high preference for the moralizing and used it the second most frequently. It seems to be a cross-cultural similarity between English and Korean that a student asking for an extension on the due date on a paper promises to do a better job on it.

One interesting thing to note is that, as compared to the English native speakers who did not provide specific reasons for asking for an extension, the Korean learners tended to offer concrete reasons. Here are examples:

> "I am unable to finish the paper. Could you let me finish it and hand it in two days? " (ENS #1)
> "I apologize for having to ask you this, but my paper isn't where I would like it to be and I was wondering if I might be able to turn it in late to you " (ENS #3)
> "I have had a little trouble on completing my paper. I 've been incredibly busy and I was wondering if I might possibly be able to get an extension " (ENS #12)
>
> "I have a problem. My son is very sick, so he is in the hospital. Then, I need some extension on my paper " (KESL #1)
> "Sir, I have tried to finish the final term paper until today, but I couldn 't. I met a slight car accident last week and I was absent-minded" (KESL #6)
> "I have a problem. I can't turn in a final term paper on time. Would you give me more time? I need more time because

my computer isn't working and my data is in hard disk in the computer " (KESL #11)

The tendency of the learners to use specific reasons does not seem to stem from their L1 usage since most of the Korean native speakers did not provide detailed reasons. As one possible explanation, in order to both increase the likelihood of gaining the hearer compliance with a request and transmit the message successfully, the learners may have thought that they needed to offer clear, specific reasons for their requests to the hearer.

Table 4-4. Frequency of Supportive moves in Situation 4 (raw scores)

	Grounder	Imposition Minimizer	Acknowledgement of Imposi-tion	Apprecia-tion	Rhetorical questions	No Use	Total
KESL	30	6	7	3	0	3	49
ENS	27	8	3	8	0	2	48
KNS	25	10	6	0	2	4	47

Situation 4)

As a part-time job, you are working as a library monitor. While checking on each floor in the library, you see a group of students that you don't know talking loudly in a non-discussion area. It seems clear that this loud noise disturbs other students ' studying. You want those students to be quiet or move to a discussion area. You approach them. What would you say?

According to Table 4-4, overall, the three language groups used supportive moves in a very similar way. Particularly, they employed nearly the same number of moves and showed considerable agreement of preference in choice of grounder. Most of the English native speakers realized their requests with head acts preceded or followed by grounder and sometimes, imposition minimizer. Likewise, the Korean native speakers followed this pattern though some of them added acknowledgement of imposition to their requests. Such an overall similarity between the two may be due to a relationship between a speaker and a hearer in this situation. That is, the speaker has a definite right to ask the hearer to be quiet while the hearer has a corresponding obligation to comply with the request. Accordingly, in realizing a request, all the speaker needs to do is to think about a head act, cogent reasons or explanations for his/her request and some types of mitigating moves. The Korean learners of ESL were very similar to the two native speaker groups in the overall use of supportive moves in this situation though there were some differences between them and the English native speakers in the use of such moves as the acknowledgement of imposition and appreciation. The following are some examples of request realizations from each group:

"Would it be possible for you to maybe quiet down a little or talk somewhere else. There are students trying to study in here" (ENS #11)
"Hey, this is a quiet area, so you guys have to keep it down or move " (ENS #17)

"Here is a public area. Noise disturbs other students ' studying. Why don't you go to a cafeteria for talk? " (KNS #7)
I'm sorry but this is a quiet area. I 'd appreciate it if you could move to other areas for discussion " (KNS #11)

"Excuse me. This is a non-discussion area. Could you be quiet? Or there is a discussion area " (KESL #14)
"Excuse me, I think that this area is a non-discussion area. If you guys want to discuss something, can you move to a discussion area? I 'm sorry" (KESL #24)

Table 4-5. Frequency of Supportive moves in Situation 5 (raw scores)

	Grounder	Disarm -er	Moraliz -ing	Imposition Minimizer	Acknowledgement of Imposition	Apprecia-tion	Con-cern	No Use	Total
KESL	36	2	1	1	9	2	1	0	52
ENS	31	0	0	1	2	12	0	0	46
KNS	32	0	0	1	12	0	0	1	46

Situation 5)

You live in a dormitory. It's about 12 o' clock midnight. You are preparing for a mid-term examination tomorrow. However, you can't concentrate on studying because you have been hearing loud music coming from a nearby room for more than an hour. You don't know the student who lives there. You want him/her to turn down the music. You go to his/her room. What would you say?

Table 4-5 shows that the subcategory of grounder was chosen as the most frequent use of supportive move by all three groups. For the second most preferred choice, many of the English native speakers selected appreciation while both the Korean native speakers and the ESLKorean learners employed acknowledgement of imposition. So most of the English native speakers tended to end their requests with appreciation like 'thanks', or 'thank you', while the Korean native speakers and the learners closed their requests with acknowledgement of imposition such as I'm sorry', or 'sorry to bother you.'

One thing to note is that, as compared to the native speakers of both English and Korean, the Korean learners preferred to use attention getters (e.g., hi, excuse me, hey, or hello) at the beginning of their requests and started requests with introduction of themselves. Further they had a tendency to provide more than one reason and acknowledgement in which they attempted to express apologies or regrets about their requests and at the same time, persuade the hearer to turn down the music. Such an overuse of moves, which was not found in the English native speakers' data, is likely to make the learners sound odd and appear pragmatically deficient. Here are examples:

"Excuse me. I live in the nearby room. It is too bad for me if I interfere your private living style. But I have an exam tomorrow. Would you please turn down your music? *I'm very very sorry"* (KESL #9)
"Excuse me. My name is ___, and I'm living next room. I think you turn on music too loudly. I can't concentrate on studying because of loud music. Do you mind turning down the music?" (KESL #22)
"Hi, I'm sorry, time is very late. Do you finish your mid-term exam? Well I 'll take a big exam tomorrow, but I didn't study yesterday. So I have to study now, but I can't concentrate on studying because of your radio. Could you turn down the music?" (KESL #23)

Table 4-6. Frequency of Supportive moves in Situation 6 (raw scores)

	Prepara tor	Pre-commit ment	Ground er	Disa rmer	Moraliz ing	Imposition Minimizer	Acknowledg ement of Im-position	Apprecia-tion	Con-cern	No Use	Total
KESL	7	6	37	1	0	5	2	1	5	0	64
ENS	1	0	35	0	2	5	3	8	0	0	54
KNS	2	0	33	0	1	12	4	0	0	1	53

Situation 6)

You need to read an important article to write a final term paper. Today you have just found that a library does not have the scholarly journal which includes this article. You have heard that a new professor in your department has this article. Since you haven't had a chance to meet and talk with this professor before, you do not know him/her. You want to ask him/her to lend the article to you. You go to his/her office, and knock on the door. What would you say?

As in the previous situations, all three language groups showed the highest preference for grounder in situation 6. As the second most frequent use of move, the English native speakers tended to use appreciation at the end of requests while the Korean native speakers chose imposition minimizer, which reduces degree of imposition created by the act. Also most of the subjects in the three groups gave their names to a hearer (i.e., professor) right after attention getters, which suggests that across cultures, it is one way of being polite to offer a name to a higher-status and unfamiliar interlocutor before making a request.

As in previous situations, the ESL Korean learners had a tendency to overuse supportive moves in this situation as compared to the two native speaker groups. They used a wider range of moves and often employed the same move twice, so that they elaborated the background and the reasons involved in the act being requested. In doing so, they provided more information than needed for the act, and some of it may be seen as irrelevant or redundant by the hearer. As a result, such behaviors of the learners can lead to pragmatic failure with the violation of the English native speaker's pragmatic rules like those suggested by Grice (1975) (i.e., "Do not make your contribution more informative than is required", "Be brief"). Here are some of the examples showing the learners' talk-too-much behaviors:

> "Hello. My name is ___ . I'm taking a ___ class. And for my class I have to read an article. I heard that you have the article. I come here to ask you if I can borrow that article from you. You're the only source of that article for me" (KESL #21)
> "Excuse me, sir. My name is ___ , and I'm senior now. I'm preparing a final term paper. I need one article. But there isn't the article in the library. I heard that you have the article. Can you do me a favor? I really need the article" (KESL #22)
> "Excuse me, Dr. ___ . My name is ___ who study a major which is similar to you. Nice to meet you. Nowadays I have to submit my final term paper. So I just try to find the scholarly journal, but there is nothing in library. The other day, fortunately I heard that you had the article that I wanted. So would you mind lending the article to me? As soon as I can, I will return to you" (KESL #28)

Table 4-7. Frequency of Supportive moves in Situation 7 (raw scores)

	Preparator	Pre-commitment	Grounder	disarmer	Promise of Reward	Imposition Minimizer	Acknowledgement of Imposition	Appreciation	Threat	Con-cern	No Use	Total
KESL	8	4	34	1	12	0	3	4	1	5	0	72
ENS	0	1	22	0	8	1	0	7	0	2	3	44
KNS	0	1	24	1	18	1	8	0	0	17	1	71

Situation 7)

You are the owner of a book store. Your shop clerk has worked for a year, and you have gotten to know him/her quite well. It is the beginning of the semester, and you are very busy selling and refunding textbooks all day. Today you have a plan to extend business hours by an hour, and you want to ask the clerk to stay after store hours. What would you say?

According to Table 4-7, though there were differences between the English native speakers and the Korean native speakers in the total number of the use of supportive moves, the two groups show similar patterns in using such moves as grounder and promise of reward as in "Could you possibly stay on for that extra hour? *I'll pay you double an hourly wage*" (ENS #14) and "As you know, the beginning of semester makes us very busy. Can you work one more hour? *I'll pay for it*" (KNS #2). As the third most

preferred choice, the English native speakers employed appreciation while the Korean native speakers selected concern, showing the speaker's concern about the hearer's ability, willingness, or availability to carry out the request.

That is, in spite of considerable familiarity between a higher-status speaker (the owner of a book store) and a lower-status hearer (a clerk) in situation 7, most of the English native speakers did not forget to express appreciation for the hearer's compliance at the end of request while many Korean native speakers tended to focus on checking time availability of the hearer before making head acts (e.g., "*If you do not have an important appointment,* I want you to work for one more hour" - KNS #6, "We have so many things to do. *If you are not busy*, do you mind working one more hour?" - KNS #10).

Like the two native speaker groups, the Korean learners of ESL showed a strong preference for the subcategory of grounder and promise of reward. One interesting thing to note is that some of the learners used lengthy openers, and one learner employed threat as a supportive move, which was absent from the English native speakers' responses:

> *"Hello. Are you fine? How's your day? How's your parents? Is there any problem? It somewhat long time to work with you, isn't it? Are you satisfied with this work? Any way thanks very much about your faithful work* . Now I'm planning to extend business hour" (KNS #8)
> *"Hi! ___ . You look good. Do you have a date with a woman? Can I talk to you?* I need your help" (KNS #11)
> "Clerk, I should say something to say. These days you know the store is so busy. So I need much help from you. Can you work more time? If you do that, I 'll give you more salary and really appreciate it to you. *If you can't do it, I should hire one more clerk, but I don 't want that"* (KESL #19)

The above lengthy openers can lead to pragmatic errors since they may not only distract the interlocutor's attention from a head act and thus weaken the illocutionary force of it but also violate Grice's (1975) cooperative principles (i.e., maxim of manner: "avoid unnecessary prolixity"). Also the use of threat can cause a serious problem since it can give mental shock or break the relationship.

Table 4-8. Frequency of Supportive moves in Situation 8 (raw scores)

	Prepara tor	Pre commit ment	Ground er	Disar mer	Promise of Re ward	Imposit ion Minimi zer	Acknowled gement of Imposition	Appreci ation	Serious ness/ Urgency	No Use	Total
KESL	8	6	44	10	2	1	3	2	1	0	77
ENS	3	4	29	6	2	1	0	3	0	3	51
KNS	2	3	27	13	3	2	6	0	4	4	64

Situation 8)
You are typing a term paper on a computer. Suddenly, the computer breaks, and you don 't know how to fix it. The paper should be submitted by tomorrow because the professor will be out of town for a while. You know that your close friend has the same computer you use. You want to ask him/her to let you use his/her computer for typing the paper. What would you say?

Table 4-8 indicates that there was some agreement among three language groups in using supportive moves in situation 8. All three groups tended to show a sequence of request, i.e., a head act + grounder + disarmer, with the use of preparator and precommitment as openers. That is, they preferred to provide the reasons for using a computer and attempted to remove potential objections by employing

disarmer:

> "Hey, I'm having a major crisis over here! Can I use your computer tonight? That paper I was typing is completely gone" (ENS #3)
> "Hello, will you be using your computer tonight? I really need your help. My computer just broke and my term paper is unfinished. Since your computer is the same, may I use it to finish my work? " (ENS #10)
>
> "Hi, I have to hand in the paper. But my computer was out of order. If you don 't use your computer, do you mind if I use it?" (KNS #7)
> "Hi, __ , are you busy now? I need to write the paper, and the computer broke. Do you mind if I use yours? It won 't take long (KNS #18)
>
> "Hi, __ , how are you? I have some problems. My computer isn't working. I must submit my paper by tomorrow. I worry about my paper. If you don't use your computer, could you let me use it, please? " (KESL #11)
> "Hey! Man. I really need your help. I must type a term paper, but computer is out of order. If you have no plan to use a computer today, can I borrow your computer? " (KESL #15)

In addition, some native speakers of English expressed appreciation for the hearer compliance with the act (e.g., "Thanks, you're the best!") while some native speakers of Korean added acknowledgement of imposition (e.g., "I'm sorry") and expressed the seriousness or urgency of the act being requested (e.g., "Can I use your computer? Please. If it is not submitted by tomorrow, *a serious thing would happen*" - KNS #22, "Can I go over to your home and use the computer? *The matter is urgent*" - KNS #23).

The ESL Korean learners, as in other situations, chose the subcategory of grounder as the most preferred move. They used a wider range of moves and more supportive moves than the two native speaker groups (77 times in the KESL, 51 times in the ENS and 64 times in the KNS):

> "Are you busy? My computer broke suddenly. I have to hand in my term paper until tomorrow. If you don 't use your computer, can you lend your computer? I will use your computer carefully. If you use it now, I can wait you" (KESL #16)
> "Hi, friend. I have a favor. I want to use your computer because my computer is broken, and I should submit my paper by tomorrow. Please. I know you help me " (KESL #19)
> "Can I talk with you? I have some problems. I have to turn in this paper by tomorrow. My computer is broken. So I can't use this computer. I need your help. I want to use your computer if you don 't mind (KESL #24)

The overall use of supportive moves by the learners in situation 8 revealed a typical feature of interlanguage (i.e., approximating the target language norms and simultaneously, transferring L1 norms into L2 performance). In other words, they were similar to the English native speakers in expressing appreciation and at the same time, may have been affected by L1 in using moves such as the disarmer, acknowledgement, and seriousness and urgency.

Table 4-9. Frequency of Supportive moves in Situation 9 (raw scores)

	Preparator	Precommitment	Grounder	Disarmer	Seriousness/ Urgency	Imposition Minimizer	Acknowledgement of Imposition	Appreciation	Concern	No Use	Total
KESL	15	1	33	1	4	4	2	1	2	0	63
ENS	1	1	30	0	0	3	3	6	0	1	45
KNS	3	1	23	1	1	9	5	1	1	4	49

Situation 9)

You are looking for a book that you need to read for writing a term paper. Today you have just found that this book was checked out and recalled by another student, which means that you will have to wait for at least a month. You have about a week to write the paper. You know that your professor has this book. Because you have taken a course from this professor, you know him/her. You want to ask the professor to lend the book to you. You go to his/her office, and knock on the door. What would you say?

As shown in Table 4-9, in situation 9 the native speakers of English relied mainly on one subcategory of supportive move, i.e., grounder, in order to reduce the imposition created by the requested act though some of them used another subcategory of appreciation. Likewise, the native speakers of Korean realized their requests by mostly using the grounder while others tended to add the imposition minimizer (e.g., "I'll return it as soon as possible", "I'll keep it carefully", "I'll give it back to you right away"). The ESL Korean learners showed considerable similarities to the English native speakers in the use of the grounder.

However, when it comes to employing the preparator by which a speaker prepares a hearer for the upcoming request, the learners differed greatly from the English native speakers. While most of them tended to offer the preparator once, some used it twice. Here are some examples:

"Good afternoon, Dr. ___ . How are you? I have something to talk to you. Do you have time? I have a problem ..." (KESL #17)
"Hello, I would like to take to you. Do you have a time? I have a big problem ... " (KESL #23)
"Hi! Can I enter now? Are you busy? Can I tell you something? ..." (KESL #27)

Such an overuse was not found in the English native speakers' responses and is likely to be one source of deviation from the L2 pragmatic norms. Since the native speakers of Korean did not employ the preparator often, the learners' overuse of it did not seem to be L1 transfer-induced (15 times in the KESL and 3 times in the KNS). A possible explanation may be that since the learners did not have sufficient L2 sociolinguistic knowledge to successfully cope with face-threatening situations in which they should perform requests to a higher status person (professor), before making the head act, they attempted to give familiarity or check availability of the hearer in order to both appear polite and increase the possibility of the hearer's compliance with the act being requested.

Table 4-10. Frequency of Supportive moves in Situation 10 (raw scores)

	Grounder	Moralizing	Threat	Acknowledgement of Imposition	Rhetorical questions	No Use	Total
KESL	26	1	3	1	13	0	44
ENS	14	1	0	3	21	2	41
KNS	15	0	0	0	15	2	32

Situation 10)

You are a police officer. You see a car driving 50 miles an hour on campus, where the speed limit is 30 miles an hour. You stop the car and approach the driver, who seems to be a student. What would you say?

As compared to previous situations in which the English native speakers used the grounder as the most preferred choice of supportive move, they employed the subcategory of rhetorical questions

most often in situation 10. Before requesting a driver to slow down or show a driver's license, many of them tended to provide rhetorical questions in which they were not interested in an answer but in criticizing the driver for violating the speed limit, or pointing out the problem involved in the act. Similarly, the Korean native speakers showed a lower preference for the grounder than did they in other situations and employed the same number of rhetorical questions as grounder. Though the ESL Korean learners used grounder most frequently, they also chose rhetorical questions quite often. The following are some examples of rhetorical questions:

> *"Did you know how fast you were going?* You need to slow down and obey the speed limits around here " (ENS #6)
> "Driving dangerously in a campus full of students can result in something awful. *How would you feel if you were walking to class and someone sped by you at these high speeds? "* (ENS #14)
>
> *"Can't you see the girl walking over there? "* (KNS #17)
> *"Don't you know the speed limits is 20 km on campus?* I need you to slow down" (KNS #22)
>
> *"Do you know you drove 50 miles an hour?* Give me your driver's license" (KESL #17)
> *"Do you know why I stop your car?* You drove car at the speed 50 miles an hour. But the speed limits is 30 miles an hour here. Can I see your driver's license?" (KESL #22)

A possible explanation for a high occurrence of rhetorical questions in this situation is that as a police officer who has a definite right to stop a car and ask for a driver's license, the subjects in the three groups might have thought that the use of rhetorical questions could be one way of showing authority and allow them to make the driver realize the violation of speed limits in a clear, efficient manner.

Table 4-11. Frequency of Supportive moves in Situation 11 (raw scores)

	Prepa-rator	Ground-er	Disarm-er	Promise of Reward	Morali zing	Acknowledge ment of Im-position	Appreci ation	Con-cern	No Use	Total
KESL	3	27	22	1	1	0	1	6	2	63
ENS	0	15	7	0	1	1	3	1	11	39
KNS	0	24	10	4	0	6	0	6	2	52

Situation 11)

For the first time this semester, you are taking a mathematics course. You have had a hard time following lectures and understanding the textbook. A test is scheduled to be held next week. You notice that one student sitting next to you seems to have a good background knowledge of math, and is doing well. Since it is the beginning of the semester, you do not know him/her yet. You want to ask him/her to study together for the upcoming test. What would you say?

In situation 11, the subjects in three language groups used the subcategory of grounder most often to decrease the imposition by providing the reasons why they wanted to study together with the hearer. As the second most preferred subcategory of move, 11 out of the 30 English native speakers chose not to use any mitigating supportive moves while the Korean native speakers and the learners selected the disarmer by which they tried to remove any potential objections raised by the hearer. Among those English native speakers who did not employ any move, some started requests with introducing themselves while others directly entered into head acts. Here are examples:

"Hey, my name is ___ . Nice to meet you. I was just wondering if you wanted to maybe study for this test next week? " (ENS #16)
"Hi. My name is ___ . I was wondering if you 'd like to study together for the upcoming test " (ENS #19)
"Hey, you want to get together to study this stuff for the test " (ENS #17)
"Do you think that you could help me study for this exam? " (ENS #20)

The above finding was somewhat surprising, and as a possible explanation, in light of Matsumoto's (1988) suggestion that a western society emphasizes individuality and values the individual's claims for his/her own territory, the native speakers of English may have been concerned more about not interrupting the hearer's individual right to act freely than about succeeding in gaining his/her compliance with the request by using supportive moves (i.e., they may have wanted not to appear to need help).

The ESL Korean learners preferred the disarmer as the second most frequent use of move, which indicates that L1 transfer may have been operative since the native speakers of Korean showed some preference for this move:

"Hello. I ___ . *You seem to be good at math and follow the lecture well.* I'm sorry but may I ask you some questions?" (KNS #9)
"If you do not have anyone to study with, how about preparing for the test with me? In fact, I do not know what to do with it, and *you seem to have a good background knowledge of math. If it 's ok, let 's get together* " (KNS #11)

"Hi! I'm ___ . *I have seen you since this class began and found you are a very good student. I was surprised you can understand everything that I can not.* Could you help me for the upcoming test? " (KESL #2)
"You don't know me, do you? Let me introduce myself to you. My name is ___ . I 'm taking a math course now. I have had a hard time following lectures. *I heard that you are really good at math. I think you can help me very well.* Could you help me?" (KESL #7)

Table 4-12. Frequency of Supportive moves in Situation 12 (raw scores)

	Preparator	Grounder	Acknowledgement of Imposition	Appreciation	No Use	Total
KESL	1	29	7	3	2	42
ENS	0	21	3	6	5	35
KNS	0	21	7	0	7	35

Situation 12)
You are taking a course from a professor whom you have never seen before. Today is the first day of class. The professor talks about important things, such as textbooks, assignments and exams. Since a classroom is rather large and the professor speaks with a soft voice, you can 't hear him/her well. What would you say?

In situation 12, the English native speakers preferred the grounder and appreciation while the Korean native speakers showed the frequent use of the grounder and acknowledgement of imposition. The ESL Korean learners used the grounder more frequently than the other two groups. For the use of the second most preferred move, they liked to employ the acknowledgement of imposition by which they apologized for the situation involved in the act, or the act being requested. Such behaviors of the learners seem to be influenced by L1 pragmatic rules since many of the native speakers of Korean preferred to apologize before making head acts in the situation:

"*I,m sorry, sir.* I can,t hear you well" (KNS #2)
"Sir, *I am really sorry* but I can't hear you in the back. Would you speak a little louder? " (KNS #4)
"*I am sorry, sir.* I can't hear what you are saying now. Would you speak up? " (KNS #13)

"Sir, *I'm sorry that I interrupt you*. But I can't hear you. Could you speak up, please?" (KESL #14)
"Excuse me, sir. *I'm sorry that I stop talking,* but I can't hear you. Can you speak more loudly?" (KESL #22)
"Excuse me, I can't hear your speech. *I'm sorry.* Could you turn up your voice?" (KESL #24)

On the basis of the findings of the use of supportive moves by three language groups so far, the following can be summarized.

(1) Across twelve situations the three language groups used nine subcategories of mitigating supportive moves and six subcategories of aggravating supportive moves in order to increase the possibility of the hearer's compliance with a request.

(2) The three language groups employed the subcategory of grounder as the most preferred choice of move across the situations. That is, they liked to provide the reasons for the act being requested before or after making head acts. A possible explanation for such a heavy reliance on the grounder is that making the hearer understand the reasons behind requests would be psychologically the best way to reduce the imposition created by requests and increase the possibility of getting the hearer's compliance (House & Kasper, 1987).

(3) There were similarities and differences between the English native speakers and the Korean native speakers in the use of supportive moves across the situations. For instance, in light of the finding that the two groups tended to employ the subcategory of moralizing frequently in situation 3 (Paper), the two cultures seemed to be similar in that a student asking a professor for an extension on the due date on the paper promises to do a better job on it. As for the differences, in situation 2 (Notebook) many of the Korean native speakers employed the subcategory of promise of reward whereas none of the English native speakers used it. Such a tendency indicated a Korean cultural characteristic that when a person receives benefits or kindness from another, he/she is supposed to repay it. Also in situation 11 (Math exam), most of the English native speakers chose not to use any mitigating supportive moves while the Korean native speakers employed the subcategory of disarmer by which they tried to remove any potential objections raised by the hearer. This finding was explained by a culture-specific characteristic of a western society emphasizing individuality and individual claims for his/her own territory. Accordingly, it was suggested that the native speakers of English may have focused more on not interrupting the hearer's individual right to act freely than gaining his/her compliance by using supportive moves.

(4) Like the two native speaker groups, the Korean learners of ESL showed the highest preference for the grounder in all situations. Also they employed consistently more supportive moves than the two native speaker groups across the situations. This talk-too-much behavior of language learners has been called "waffling" (Edmondson & House, 1991) and would not be found in target language speakers' data. Such a phenomenon has been reported in many studies of interlanguage speech acts (e.g., Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986; House & Kasper, 1987; Rintell & Mitchell, 1989). One serious consequence of such

waffling is the violation of Grice's (1975) conversational maxim (i.e., maxim of manner: "Be brief", "Avoid unnecessary prolixity"). Further, being verbose can make the Korean learners appear pragmatically deficient since the hearer may see some of the information provided as redundant or irrelevant and since the verbosity can distract the hearer's attention from a request and weaken the illocutionary force of it. Not having sufficient L2 pragmatic knowledge, the Korean learners might have hoped that producing lengthy responses would contribute greatly to mitigating the threat created by the act, seeming polite, and getting their message across.

(5) The Korean learners showed a typical characteristic of interlanguage in using supportive moves across the situations. That is, they were similar to the English native speaker group in the use of some moves and thus showed approximation to the target language norms. At the same time, they differed from the English native speaker group in the use of other moves by relying on L1 pragmatic norms. This L1 transfer was one important source of pragmatic errors in the Korean learners' data.

2) Expression of politeness (the use of downgraders)

As stated earlier, though no consensus has been reached among researchers as to what politeness is about, and no clear definition of politeness has been proposed in interlanguage pragmatics, in this study, however, politeness in requests was viewed as a function of one pragmatic feature, downgrading. Politeness being so viewed, the examination of how it is expressed amounts to the investigation of the use of downgraders by the subjects of the study. To this end, first, the twelve situations in the DCT were classified into six categories according to two variables, i.e., familiarity and social power. This was the way the DCT was developed (see data analysis section). Each category is given below:

Category 1 (+ social distance, - social status): Situation 6 and 12
Category 2 (- social distance, - social status): Situation 3 and 9
Category 3 (+ social distance, + social status): Situation 4 and 10
Category 4 (- social distance, + social status): Situation 1 and 7
Category 5 (+ social distance, 0 social status): Situation 5 and 11
Category 6 (- social distance, 0 social status): Situation 2 and 8

The main reason for the classification of situations into the six categories was to look into how the subjects of the study express politeness (i.e., employed downgraders) under different situations where the two situational variables were combined in various ways. Second, Korean native speakers' data were not considered since there is no comparability between Korean and English in the use of downgraders. As a result, a comparison was made only between the English native speakers and the ESL Korean learners in types and frequencies of downgraders in twelve situations (i.e., six categories). Definition and examples of each downgrader used for classification in the study were presented earlier in Table 3.

(1) Category 1 (+ familiarity, - social power): Situation 6 and 12

Situation 6)

You need to read an important article to write a final term paper. Today you have just found that a library does not have the scholarly journal which includes this article. You have heard that a new professor in your department has this article. Since you haven't had a chance to meet and talk with this professor before, you do not know him/her. You want to ask him/her to lend the article to you. You go to his/her office, and knock on the door. What would you say?

Situation 12)

You are taking a course from a professor whom you have never seen before. Today is the first day of class. The professor talks about important things, such as textbooks, assignments and exams. Since a classroom is rather large and the professor speaks with a soft voice, you can 't hear him/her well. What would you say?

Table 5-1. Frequency of Downgraders in Category 1 (raw scores)

	Politeness marker	Play down	Consultative device	Understater	Downtoner	Subjectivizer	Agent avoider	Total
KESL	15	0	6	7	0	0	1	29
ENS	18	11	2	6	6	0	6	49

The first category is characterized by the presence of social power and the absence of familiarity. It includes situations 6 and 12 in which a speaker is likely to perceive him/herself as both socially and psychologically very distant from a hearer since he/she (student) asks the hearer (a professor) whom he/she does not know to do something. So the speaker would use downgraders quite frequently to achieve the high degree of politeness in this category (see Tanaka & Kawade, 1982 for their Distance-Politeness hypothesis).

The distribution of downgraders (Table 5-1) shows that the English native speakers employed a wider range of downgraders than the Korean learners. Also the English native speakers used more downgraders than the learners in such a way that, most of the time, they tended to combine one downgrader with another within a given request strategy whereas the learners used one downgrader alone such as politeness marker ('please'), consultative device, or understater. The following examples show this difference between the two groups:

"I *was wondering* if I could *possibly* borrow an article to copy it" (S6, ENS #13)
"I *was wondering* if *it would be possible* to copy it" (S6, ENS #19)
"Could you *please* talk *a little* louder?" (S12, ENS #1)
"*Do you think* you could speak *a little* louder" (S12, ENS #18)

"Could you *please* lend it to me?" (S6, KESL #2)
"Could I see your article *for a while*?" (S6, KESL #11)
"Would you speak louder *please*?" (S12, KESL #7)
"Can you speak *a little* loudly" (S12, KESL #27)

It is clear that two downgraders add more politeness to a given request strategy than one (House & Kasper, 1981). Thus the English native speaker group was more polite than the Korean learner group by using more downgraders within a strategy. In addition, some of the learners showed a preference for imperatives (i.e., the mood derivable) with politeness marker ('please') preposed as in "Please say it again", "Please turn up your voice", and "Please say loudly". Such responses were absent from the English native speakers' data. In sum, the English native speakers showed an overall tendency to be more

polite than the Korean learners in the use of downgraders in category 1.

(2) Category 2 (- familiarity, - social power): Situation 3 and 9

Situation 3)

Tomorrow is the due date of a final term paper for one of the courses you take this semester. However, you are not able to turn it in on time. You want to talk to the professor, whom you have known for a couple of years, and ask him/her to give you an extension on the paper. You go to his/her office and knock on the door. What would you say?

Situation 9)

You are looking for a book that you need to read for writing a term paper. Today you have just found that this book was checked out and recalled by another student, which means that you will have to wait for at least a month. You have about a week to write the paper. You know that your professor has this book. Because you have taken a course from this professor, you know him/her. You want to ask the professor to lend the book to you. You go to his/her office, and knock on the door. What would you say?

Table 5-2. Frequency of Downgraders in Category 2 (raw scores)

	Politeness marker	Play down	Consultative device	Understater	Downtoner	Subjectivizer	Agent avoider	Total
KESL	15	1	1	3	1	0	1	22
ENS	9	16	2	2	7	1	7	44

The second category is characterized by the presence of both social power and familiarity. It includes situations 3 and 9 in which a speaker is likely to perceive him/herself as socially distant but psychologically close to a hearer since he/she (student) asks the hearer (a professor) whom he/she knows to do something. It seems that presence of familiarity between interlocutors would allow the speaker to invest less politeness to the hearer than absence of it though superior social power of the hearer still requires the speaker to use the high degree of politeness.

Table 5-2 shows the frequency of downgraders used by the English native speakers and the Korean learners in the second category. As compared to the first category, the total use of downgraders decreased (49 times -> 44 times in the ENS, and 29 times -> 22 times in the KESL). That is, there was a small reduction in the total amount of downgrading, which indicates that, overall, both groups showed agreement of investing less politeness in the second category than in the first category. However, when it comes to comparing downgraders used by the two groups, they differed greatly from each other, so that it was easier to note differences than similarities between them. Above all, the English native speaker group outnumbered the learner group in the total use of downgraders (44 times vs 22 times), which means that the former demonstrated more politeness than the latter. Also while the English native speakers used various types of downgraders, the learners relied on a few types and showed limitations in the repertoire of downgraders.

For instance, the English native speakers preferred to use the downgraders such as play-down (syntactic devices to tone down the perlocutionary effect a request has on the hearer: durative aspect marker: 'I was wondering if', politeness marker ('please'), downtoner (sentence modifiers to reduce the imposition of the act being requested: 'just', 'possibly', or 'maybe') , and agent avoider (syntactic devices

by which the speaker does not mention the hearer as the agent of the action requested:'Would it be possible ..?'). On the other hand, the learners showed a heavy reliance on politeness marker and downtoner. Here are examples:

"*I was wondering* if I could have an extension on the due date " (S3, ENS #7)
"*I was wondering* if you might have a copy of this book that I could borrow " (S9, ENS #8)
"May I *please* have an extension on the final paper? " (S3, ENS #16)
"*I thought* I would ask you if I could *possibly* borrow it for a couple days" (S9, ENS #17)
"*Is it possible* for me to get an extension? " (S3, ENS #12)

"Can I turn in the paper *a little* later?" (S3, KESL #10)
"*Please* give me an extension on the paper " (S3, KESL #20)
"I'd like to borrow your book, *please*" (S9, KESL #20)
"I *just* came here to borrow the book from you " (S9, KESL #23)
"Can you *please* lend me the book?" (S9, KESL #16)

It is interesting to note that the English native speakers showed a strong preference for durative aspect marker (play-down), 'I was wondering if ...', so that the frequency with which they used this marker was 15 out of 44 times whereas it was employed only once by the learners. In fact, the syntactic device, 'I was wondering if ...', was one of the most frequently used downgraders in American subjects' responses in other categories as well. The underuse of this device by the learners seems to indicate that they were not accustomed to using the device as a downgrader in realizing the speech act of requests though they might know its literal meaning.

(3) Category 3 (+ familiarity, + social power): Situation 4 and 10

Situation 4)
As a part-time job, you are working as a library monitor. While checking on each floor in the library, you see a group of students that you don't know talking loudly in a non-discussion area. It seems clear that this loud noise disturbs other students ' studying. You want those students to be quiet or move to a discussion area. You approach them. What would you say?

Situation 10)
You are a police officer. You see a car driving 50 miles an hour on campus, where the speed limit is 30 miles an hour. You stop the car and approach the driver, who seems to be a student. What would you say?

Table 5-3. Frequency of Downgraders in Category 3 (raw scores)

	Politeness marker	Play down	Consultative device	Under stater	Down-toner	Subject-ivizer	Agent avoider	Total
KESL	16	0	1	2	1	0	0	20
ENS	23	1	3	2	3	0	1	32

The third category is characterized by the presence of social power and the absence of familiarity. It includes situations 4 and 10 in which a speaker is likely to perceive him/herself as both socially and psychologically distant from a hearer since he/she (library monitor, or police officer) asks the hearer (a group of students or a student driver) whom he/she does not know to do something. One great difference between the first and third category is that in the first category, the hearer has more social power than the speaker (i.e., hearer dominance) while in the third category, the reverse is the case (i.e.,

speaker dominance). It seems that a hearer-dominant situation usually requires the higher level of politeness than a speaker-dominant situation if a variable, familiarity, holds constant. Accordingly, both language groups would demonstrate less politeness in the third category than in the first category.

According to Table 5-3, as compared to the first category, a sharp decrease was observed in the total use of downgraders in the third category (49 times -> 32 times in the ENS and 29 times -> 20 times in the KESL). In other words, there was a reduction in the total amount of downgrading, which indicates that both the English native speakers and the Korean learners invested less politeness in the third category than in the first category. Also Table 5-3 shows that the distribution of downgraders used by each group was similar. Both groups employed the downgrader, politeness marker, most frequently while they showed a very low preference for other downgraders. As a rule, most of the subjects in the two groups tended to insert the marker 'please' into either imperatives, or conventionally indirect request structures beginning with 'Can/Could you ..?'. In addition, whereas more than one downgrader were used quite often within a given head act in the first category, this was not the case with the third category.

One interesting thing to note is that in using the politeness marker, the Korean learners preferred to use the form imperatives without 'please' while they inserted it into conventional indirect request structures. Such an usage was more pronounced in situation 10 (Police officer) than in situation 4 (Noise), and was also found in the Korean native speakers' data but not in the English native speakers'. So L1 transfer effects may have been operative. As a possible explanation, the learners' preference for imperatives without the politeness marker seems to reflect a characteristic of a Korean society, i.e., authoritarianism, in which a person of authority or higher social status is supposed to use crude language with no politeness to a subordinate, or a person of no authority. Here are some examples:

"*Please* be quiet, or move to a discussion area " (S4, ENS #6)
"*Please* quiet down" (S4, ENS #25)
"*Please* slow down" (S10, ENS #1)

"Be careful" (S10, KESL #11)
"Give me your driver 's license" (S10, KESL #12)
"Give me all ID 's you have" (S10, KESL #13)

"Let me see your driver 's license" (S10, KNS #10)
"Be careful next time" (S10, KNS #12)
"Drive less than 20 km" (S10, KNS #28)

Even though the form of imperatives is regarded as an appropriate choice of a request strategy in the situations, using it without the politeness marker 'please' can lead the learners to running the risk of appearing rude or authoritative to the target language speakers.

(4) Category 4 (- familiarity, + social power): Situation 1 and 7

Situation 1)

As a part-time job, you are working as a computer assistant in a computer lab. It is the end of the semester, and there are many students waiting for their turn to use computers. While consulting one student 's problems, you see your classmate playing games excitedly. Academic use always precedes non-academic use in a computer lab. You approach him/her. What would you say?

Situation 7)

You are the owner of a book store. Your shop clerk has worked for a year, and you have gotten to know him/her quite well. It is the beginning of the semester, and you are very busy selling and refunding textbooks all day. Today you have a plan to extend business hours by an hour, and you want to ask the clerk to stay after store hours. What would you say?

Table 5-4. Frequency of Downgraders in Category 4 (raw scores)

	Politeness marker	Play down	Consultative device	Under stater	Down-toner	Subject-ivizer	Agent avoider	Total
KESL	10	1	2	2	1	4	2	22
ENS	12	4	13	3	3	1	6	42

The fourth category is characterized by the presence of both social power and familiarity. It includes situations 1 and 7 in which a speaker is likely to perceive him/herself as socially distant but psychologically close to a hearer because he/she (computer assistant or owner of a book store) asks the hearer (classmate or clerk) whom he/she knows to do something. The third and fourth categories are alike in that the speaker has more power than the hearer (speaker dominance). However, they differ in that the speaker has no familiarity with the hearer in the third category but does in the fourth. So the speaker in the fourth category would not be expected to invest as much politeness as in the third category.

According to Table 5-4, in comparison with the third category, there was an increase in the total use of downgraders (20 -> 22 in the KESL and 32 -> 42 in the ENS). This increase indicates that, overall, both the English native speakers and the ESL Korean learners invested more politeness in the fourth category than in the third category. This finding contradicts the above expectation. A possible explanation is that, since both situations of the third category have scenarios that allow the speaker to definitely make requests, and put the hearer under an obligation to comply with them, a high degree of politeness might not be necessary, whereas the fourth category includes one situation (S7) in which there is no obligation for the hearer to comply and so the speaker employs mitigation and politeness to reduce the impositive force of request.

Regarding the comparison of downgraders used by the two groups, the English native speakers employed almost twice as many as the Korean learners (42 times in the ENS and 22 times in the KESL). Also they used more downgraders than the learners within each type of downgrader except for the subjectivizer by which a speaker expresses his/her opinion with regard to the state of affairs and lowers the assertive force of request (e.g., 'I think', 'I believe', 'In my opinion').

As can be seen in Table 5-4, the learner group made the most frequent use of the politeness marker ('please') while, besides this marker, the English native speaker group preferred to employ the consultative device and agent avoider. The consultative device is a routine (e.g., 'Would you mind ..?') by means of which a speaker tries to involve the hearer and bid for his/her cooperation. It was used 13 times by the English natives and only 2 times by the learners. Also the agent avoider (e.g.,'Is it possible ..?'), by which the speaker avoids the explicit mentioning of the hearer as an agent of the act being requested and thus reduces the imposition, was chosen 6 times by the English natives and 2 times

by the learners. Here are examples:

"*Would you mind* giving it up?" (S1, ENS #4)
"*Would you mind* keeping the noise level to a minimum? " (S1, ENS #8)
"*Is it possible* for you to stay an extra hour?" (S7, ENS #11)
"*Would it be a problem* for you to stay for an hour?" (S7, ENS #16)
"*Would it be possible* for you to stay another hour to work?" (S7, ENS #29)

"*Please* play the game in your house!" (S1, KESL #2)
"Could you yield computer for another person *please*?" (S1, KESL #5)
"*Please* give the chair to another people waiting for using computer! " (S1, KESL #19)

"Would you *please* work an hour more with me?" (S7, KESL #7)
"Can you work after store hours *please*?" (S7, KESL #10)

Further, many of the English native speakers tended to combine one downgrader with another (e.g., consultative device + understater, agent avoider + understater, or play-down + agent avoider):

"I *was wondering* if *there is any way* you could stay another hour after work" (S7, ENS #15)
"*Would you mind maybe* waiting until later to play games on the computer? " (S1, ENS #15)
"*Would you mind* working *a little bit* longer to help me out with all this stuff" (S7, ENS #18)
"*Is it possible* for you to stay today *a little* longer?" (S7, ENS #30)

As stated earlier, two downgraders make a given request strategy more mitigated and more polite than one. Though the mere use of politeness marker ('please') alone adds certain degree of politeness to a request strategy, it is necessary for the Korean learners to learn a wide range of downgraders and know how to combine one downgrader with another in order to successfully cope with face-threatening situations.

(5) Category 5 (+ familiarity, 0 social power): Situation 5 and 11

Situation 5)
You live in a dormitory. It's about 12 o'clock midnight. You are preparing for a mid-term examination tomorrow. However, you can't concentrate on studying because you have been hearing loud music coming from a nearby room for more than an hour. You don't know the student who lives there. You want him/her to turn down the music. You go to his/her room. What would you say?

Situation 11)
For the first time this semester, you are taking a mathematics course. You have had a hard time following lectures and understanding the textbook. A test is scheduled to be held next week. You notice that one student sitting next to you seems to have a good background knowledge of math, and is doing well. Since it is the beginning of the semester, you do not know him/her yet. You want to ask him/her to study together for the upcoming test. What would you say?

Table 5-5. Frequency of Downgraders in Category 5 (raw scores)

	Politeness marker	Play down	Consultative device	Under stater	Down-toner	Subject-ivizer	Agent avoider	Total
KESL	17	0	9	3	2	2	0	33
ENS	20	17	5	7	5	0	1	55

The fifth category is characterized by the absence of both social power and familiarity. It includes situations 5 and 11 in which a speaker is likely to perceive him/herself as socially equal but psychologically distant from a hearer since he/she (student) asks the hearer (another student) whom

he/she does not know to do something. This category differs from previous categories in that the speaker and hearer are equal in social power, and the equality of social status is likely to motivate the speaker to use more-direct languages and less polite strategies in comparison with hearer dominant situations.

In accordance with Table 5-5, the total number of the use of downgraders was 55 times by the English native speakers and 33 times by the Korean learners. They are the highest frequencies ever used by the two groups (see Table 5-1, 5-2, 5-3, and 5-4). Such a high occurrence of downgraders indicates that in spite of equality of social status between interlocutors, both the English native speakers and the Korean learners were concerned about being polite and actually demonstrated the highest degree of politeness by using more downgraders in this category than in previous categories. So in contrast to the above prediction that the speaker would invest less politeness in this category, the two language groups used downgraders most frequently for achieving the highest degree of politeness. Such politeness behaviors of the groups can be explained by Wolfson's (1988, 1989a) burge theory and Leech's (1983) politeness principles.

According to Wolfson (1988, 1989a), inequality of social status allows interlocutors to see their relationship as stable and fixed, so that they know what they should expect from one another. Accordingly, a lower-status person is supposed to use the high level of politeness to a higher-status person, or vice-versa. On the other hand, equal-status interlocutors consider their relationships dynamic and unstable, which lead them to employ more words, more negotiations, and more-polite strategies. Also Leech (1983) claimed that whenever asking someone to do something, a requester should minimize benefit to him/herself and maximize cost to him/herself since politeness results from the minimization of cost and the maximization of benefit to the requestee. Hence, the finding that the English native speakers and the Korean learners invested the highest degree of politeness (i.e., maximized benefit to a requestee) fits into Leech's politeness principles.

Concerning the distribution of downgraders used by each group, the English native speakers employed a wider range of downgraders than the Korean learners. The former preferred to use the politeness marker, play-down, understater, consultative device and downtoner while the latter relied mainly on the politeness marker and consultative device. The downgrader used by both groups most frequently was the politeness marker ('please'), 20 times by the English native speakers and 17 times by the learners. As the second most preferred downgrader, the English natives used the play-down 17 times while the learners employed the consultative device 9 times.

One interesting thing to note is that most of the English native speakers tended to use the politeness marker ('please') with conventional indirect request structures (e.g., 'could/would you ..?'), and had more than one downgrader within their request strategies. In contrast, many of the learners had a tendency to use only one downgrader per a strategy and preferred to use conventional indirect request structures alone without 'please'. The following are examples:

"*Would you please* turn down the music?" (S5, ENS #1)
"*Could you please* lower your music?" (S5, ENS #2)
"*Would you please* turn down or off the music?" (S5, ENS #10)
"*Could you please* turn your music down?" (S5, ENS #11)
"I *was wondering* if you *could please* turn down your music" (S5, ENS #16)
"I *was wondering* if you *could please* turn the music down" (S5, ENS #13)
"I *was just wondering* if you *could maybe* turn your music down *a little bit*" (S5, ENS #16)
"I *was just wondering* if you *wanted to maybe* study for this test next week" (S11, ENS #15)

"*Can you* volume down your music for me?" (S5, KESL #6)
"*Can you* turn down the music?" (S5, KESL #19)
"*Could you* turn down the volume?" (S5, KESL #12)
"*Would you* turn down the music?" (S5, KESL #29)
"*I think* it's too loud to do my stuff" (S5, KESL #8)
"I *just* want to study with you" (S11, KESL #6)
"*Would you mind* if we study together for it?" (S11, KESL #12)

As can be seen from the above examples, the English native speaker group was more concerned about mitigating the imposition created by requests and thus demonstrated more politeness than the learner group.

(6) Category 6 (- familiarity, 0 social power): Situation 2 and 8

Situation 2)

You are taking a course. Last week you missed a few classes since you had a bad cold. A mid-term exam is scheduled to be held next week. You know that one of the classmates attends classes regularly and takes good notes. You want to borrow his/her notebook. You approach him/her. What would you say?

Situation 8)

You are typing a term paper on a computer. Suddenly, the computer breaks, and you don 't know how to fix it. The paper should be submitted by tomorrow because the professor will be out of town for a while. You know that your close friend has the same computer you use. You want to ask him/her to let you use his/her computer for typing the paper. What would you say?

Table 5-6. Frequency of Downgraders in Category 6 (raw scores)

	Politeness marker	Play down	Consultative device	Under stater	Down-toner	Subject-ivizer	Agent avoider	Total
KESL	8	0	3	3	1	0	0	15
ENS	17	8	3	0	4	0	5	37

Finally, the sixth category is characterized by the absence of social power and the presence of familiarity. It includes situations 2 and 8 in which a speaker is likely to perceive him/herself as socially equal and psychologically close to a hearer since he/she (student) asks the hearer (classmate or close friend) to do something. The fifth and sixth categories are alike in that interlocutors are equal in social power, but differ in that considerable degree of familiarity between interlocutors exists in the sixth category whereas no such familiarity is in the fifth category. So the speaker in this category would not invest politeness to the same extent to which he/she did in the fifth category.

The frequency of downgraders in Table 5-6 was 37 times in the English native speaker group and 15 times in the learner group. These frequencies were much lower than those (55 times in the ENS and 33 times in the KESL) shown in Table 5-5 (fifth category). Such a low frequency indicates that both groups employed fewer downgraders in this category than in the fifth category, and thus that, on the whole, they invested less politeness in the sixth category than in the fifth category. Such an agreement

between the two groups in using politeness shows that the learners knew how to invest politeness to interlocutors who were socially equal and familiar with them, and demonstrated their ability to approximate the target language norms.

As for each group's use of downgraders, as in previous categories, the English native speakers tended to be more polite than the Korean learners since they used more downgraders than the learners. The English native speakers showed the highest preference for the politeness marker (17 times) followed by the play-down (8 times). The agent avoider was the third most frequently used downgrader (5 times). In the learner group, the politeness marker was employed most often with the occurrence of 8 times. Also the learners used the consultative device 3 times and the understater 3 times as the second most preferred downgrader.

A comparison of downgraders used by the two groups showed that the English native speakers made the frequent use of such constructions as 'conventional indirect requests + politeness marker', 'I was wondering if ...', and 'Would it be possible ..?', while the Korean learners did not seem to have any favorite construction and relied heavily on one-word downgraders such as 'please' (politeness marker), 'just' (downtoner), and 'for a while' (understater) except for a construction 'would you mind ..?' with a frequency of 3 times. The constructions 'I was wondering if ...', and 'would it be possible ..?' are ritualized formulas that are usually developed in the early stages of L2 learning since they not only reduce the learning burden but help learners meet basic communication needs (Ellis, 1985).

In light of this feature of formulas, however, the Korean learners' underuse of formulaic constructions was somewhat surprising because they were all from upper-intermediate or advanced proficiency level. As a possible explanation, even though they had been introduced to these formulas in classrooms, they may not have fully understood how and in which context the formulas should be used, or may not have been familiar with them simply because they have not had plentiful opportunities to employ them for communicative purposes in contexts. It is of importance for the learners to learn and be able to use those formulas in face-threatening situations in order to not only meet their communicative needs but also appear pragmatically competent by sounding polite and showing consideration to save the hearer's face. Here are examples of the English native speakers' formulaic downgraders and the learners' one-word downgraders:

"I was wondering if I could borrow your notes" (S2, ENS #6)
"I was just wondering if you would mind if I could copy your notes from last week " (S2, ENS #12)
"I was wondering if I could look over your notes and make copy them " (S2, ENS #21)
"I was wondering if I could maybe borrow yours to finish it " (S8, ENS #10)
"Is there any way I could borrow your notes?" (S2, ENS #10)
"Would it be at all possible for me to borrow your notes? " (S2, ENS #11)
"I was wondering if it be at all possible to borrow your notes to copy them? " (S2, ENS #15)

"Please show me your notes!" (S2, KESL #1)
"Can I borrow your note for a while?" (S2, KESL #9)
"Can I borrow your computer just one hour?" (S8, KESL #18)
"Please let me use your computer! " (S8, KESL #20)
"Can I use your computer for a while?" (S8, KESL #28)

Based on the findings of the use of downgraders (i.e., expression of politeness) so far, the following can be summarized.

(1) The expression of politeness, which was viewed as a function of downgrading, was affected by two contextual factors (i.e., social power and familiarity). That is, both the English native speakers and the ESL Korean learners employed downgraders according to five situations (six categories) in which social power and familiarity were combined in various ways.

(2) The English native speaker group outnumbered the ESL Korean learner group in the total use of downgraders across the situations. They employed a wider range of downgraders than the learners, and preferred to combine one downgrader with another. The overall tendency of the English native speakers to use more downgraders than the learners in each one of the six categories clearly showed that they invested more politeness and thus were more polite than the learners. Such politeness behaviors of the English native speakers seem to reflect an American cultural characteristic that Americans are not willing to interrupt others' privacy, or freedom to act. Whenever asking someone to do something, they make efforts to achieve a high degree of politeness to reduce the imposition created by a request and save a requestee's face.

(3) The Korean learners of ESL used many fewer downgraders than the English native speakers across the situations, which indicated that they were less polite than the English native speakers. Also the learners showed limitations in the range of downgraders and relied heavily on the politeness marker ('please'), and other one-word downgraders such as understater and downtoner. Such an overreliance on the marker 'please' confirmed Scarcella's (1980) finding that some politeness strategies like 'please' are learned in the early stages of L2 learning and overused invariably. In addition, the learners preferred to have only one downgrader within a given request strategy and seldom combined one with another, which implies that they may not have known rules involving co-occurrence of downgraders and appropriate distribution of them in contexts.

4. Conclusion

The focus in this study has been on investigating the ESL Korean learners' interlanguage requests by comparing their request realizations with those of the English native speakers in terms of supportive moves and downgraders. As the results of the study indicate, supportive moves employed by the learners differed greatly from those of the English native speakers and the Korean native speakers. So the learners' use of supportive moves could not be accounted for by either L1 or L2 system but showed idiosyncracies. The learners employed consistently more supportive moves than the two native speaker groups across situations. This talk-too-much behavior is likely to result in pragmatic failure since the interlocutor may think of some of the information provided as redundant or irrelevant and since the learners' verbosity can distract the interlocutor's attention from a request and weaken the illocutionary force of it. Also the learner group differed greatly from the English native speaker group in the use of

downgraders throughout the situations. The learners didn't seem to have sufficient knowledge of an important pragmatic feature, downgrading, and showed limitations in the range of downgraders. They relied heavily on the politeness marker ('please') and a few one-word downgraders. Moreover, they didn't demonstrate knowledge about the rules involving co-occurrence of downgraders and distribution of them in contexts. Consequently, the limitations in the repertoire of downgraders and the lack of knowledge of the rules involving the use of downgraders resulted in differences between the learners and the English native speakers in expressing politeness and became one primary source of deviation from the L2 norms.

Concerning the limitations of the study, though the DCT has numerous advantages (Hartford & Bardovi-Harlig, 1992; Beebe & Cummings, 1996; Houck & Gass, 1996), informants' responses to the DCT do not necessarily represent what they would say in actual communicative situations. So in order to better understand the ESL Korean learners' use of supportive moves and politeness behaviors, it is desirable to conduct further research in which the DCT data from this study would be compared with data from other methods such as an open role-play, which allows subjects to interact in an open-ended context and organize the interaction in their own way.

Another limitation was that the ESL Korean learners' length of stay in the US was not controlled. Length of stay in the US ranged from 3 to 11 months, and the average length of residence was 4.3 months. Since there have been few studies which systematically examined the relationship between length of stay in the target community and L2 pragmatic competence, it is not clear how and to what extent the Korean learners' varied length of stay had an effect on their speech act performance. Nevertheless, existing evidence from interlanguage pragmatics research (e.g., Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1984, 1986) shows that after more than five years of stay in the target community, L2 learners began to approximate closely the native level of language use. Since the only evidence of effect is for a much longer length of stay as compared to 4.3 months of the Korean learners in the study, the uncontrolled factor, length of stay, might not have played a significant role in affecting the overall findings of the study.

The present study has some pedagogical implications. First, as the results of the study show, the learners' verbosity should be dealt with as pragmatic errors in the classroom. EFL teachers in Korea need to make an effort to correct this type of error by providing learners with plentiful opportunities to observe request realizations by native speakers of English and compare them with learners' requests. Second, the learners' behaviors in the use of downgraders imply that they have not learned about downgraders, or, if they have learned about them, they have not been accustomed to using them in communicative contexts. Since the use of downgraders is linked closely to politeness, insufficient knowledge of downgrading and underuse of downgraders can lead the Korean learners to appear impolite or even rude, unintentionally giving target language speakers the wrong image of them. As one way of preventing such a misunderstanding, the Korean students should be taught what downgrading is and how downgraders work when they are introduced to the speech act of requests. Moreover, they need to be given opportunities to practice downgraders in context for communicative purposes. So teachers are

encouraged to make their classrooms communicatively oriented, providing various activities, tasks and group work. In doing so, they can help students to become pragmatically competent language users.

References

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Oxford University Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Hartford, B. (1991). Saying "No" in English: native and nonnative rejections. *Pragmatics and Language Learning Monograph Series, 2,* 41-57.

Beebe, L. & Cummings, M. (1996). Natural speech act data versus written questionnaire data: how data collection method affects speech act performance. In S. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.),*Speech acts across cultures: challenges to communication in a second language* (pp. 65-86). New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.

Beebe, L. & Takahashi, T. (1989). Sociolinguistic variation in face-threatening speech acts: chastisement and disagreement. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage: empirical studies in second language variation* (pp. 199-218). New York, NY: Plenum.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J. & Kasper, G. (1989). Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics. In S. Blum Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper, (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies* (pp. 1-34). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S. & Levenston, E. (1987). Lexical-grammatical pragmatic indicators. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 9,* 155-170.

Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: a cross cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics, 5,* 196-213.

Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1986). Too many words: length of utterance and pragmatic failure. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 8,* 165-180.

Brislin, R., Lonner, W. & Thorndike, R. (1973). *Cross-cultural research methods.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

CELT (1994). *The Center for English Language Training*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Cohen, A. & Olshtain, E. (1994). Researching the production of second-language speech acts. In E. Tarone, S. Gass, & A. Cohen, (Eds.), *Research methodology in second-language acquisition* (pp. 143 156). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cohen, A., Olshtain, E. & Rosenstein, D. (1986). Advanced EFL apologies: what remains to be learned? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 62,* 51-74.

Edmondson, W. & House, J. (1991). Do learners talk too much? the waffle phenomenon in interlanguage pragmatics. In R. Phillipson, E. Kellerman, L. Selinker, M. Sharwood Smith, & M. Swain, (Eds.), *Foreign/second language pedagogy research: a commemorative volume for Claus Faerch* (pp. 273-287). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Eisenstein, M. & Bodman, J. (1986). 'I very appreciate': expressions of gratitude by native and non native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics, 7,* 167-185.

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition.* Oxford University Press.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14,* 219-236.

Fukushima, S. & Iwata, Y. (1985). Politeness in English. *JALT Journal, 7,* 1-14.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan, (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics, Vol. 3: speech acts* (pp. 41-58). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Houck, N. & Gass, S. (1996). Non-native refusals: a methodological perspective. In S. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures: challenges to communication in a second language* (pp. 45-64). New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.

House, J. & Kasper, G. (1981). Politeness markers in English and German. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational routines: explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech* (pp. 157-185). The Hague: Mouton.

House, J. & Kasper, G. (1987). Interlanguage pragmatics: requesting in a foreign language. In W. Loscher & R. Schulze (Eds.), *Perspectives on language in performance* (pp. 1250-1288). Tuingen: Gunter Narr.

Hwang, J. (1990). "Deference versus "Politeness" in Korean speech. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 82,* 41-55.

Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research, 8,* 203-231.

Kitao, K. (1990). A study of Japanese and American perceptions of politeness in requests.*Doshida Studies in English, 50,* 178-210.

Koike, D. A. (1989). Pragmatic competence and adult L2 acquisition: speech acts in interlanguage. *Modern Language Journal, 73,* 279-289.

Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness: or, minding your 'p' and 'q'. *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 292-305). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* London: Longman.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 12,* 403-426.

Meier, A. (1997). Teaching the universals of politeness. *ELT Journal, 51,* 21-28.

Mir-Fernandez, M. (1994). The use of English requests by native Spanish speakers and its relation to politeness values. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Olshtain, E. & Weinbach, L. (1987). Complaints: a study of speech act behavior among native and nonnative speakers of Hebrew. In J. Verschueren & M. Bertuccelli-Papi (Eds.), *The pragmatic perspective: selected papers from the 1985 international pragmatics conference* (pp. 195-208). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rintell, E. & Mitchell, C. (1989). Studying requests and apologies: an inquiry into method. In S. Blum Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper, (Eds.), *Cross-cultural pragmatics: requests and apologies* (pp. 248 272). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Scarcella, R. (1980). On speaking politely in a second language. In C. Yorio, C. Perkins & J. Schachter, (Eds.), *On TESOL '79: the learner in focus* (pp. 275-287). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Shinn, H. (1990). A survey of sociolinguistic studies in Korea. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 82,* 7-23.

Tanaka, S. & Kawade, S. (1982). Politeness strategies and second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 5,* 18-33.

Walters, J. (1980). The perception of politeness in English and Spanish. In C. Yorio, C. Perkins & J. Schachter, (Eds.), *On TESOL '79: the learner in focus* (pp. 288-296). Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Wolfson, N. (1988). The bulge: a theory of speech behavior and social distance. In J. Fine (Ed.), *Second language discourse: a textbook of current research* (pp. 21-38). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Wolfson, N. (1989a). *Perspectives: sociolinguistics and TESOL.* New York: Newbury House.

Wolfson, N. (1989b). The social dynamics of native and nonnative variation in complimenting behavior. In M. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage: empirical studies in second language variation* (pp. 219-236). New York, NY: Plenum.

Appendix A

Role relationships between a speaker and a hearer in terms of familiarity and social power in twelve situations

Situations	Familiarity (F)	Social Power (SP)	
1. Computer lab	- F	+ SP: S > H	S dominance
2. Notebook	- F	0 SP: S = H	Status equals
3. Paper	- F	- SP: S < H	H dominance
4. Noise	+ F	+ SP: S > H	S dominance
5. Music	+ F	0 SP: S = H	Status equals
6. Article	+ F	- SP: S < H	H dominance
7. Bookstore	- F	+ SP: S > H	S dominance
8. Computer	- F	0 SP: S = H	Status equals
9. Book	- F	- SP: S < H	H dominance
10. Police officer	+ F	+ SP: S > H	S dominance

11. Math exam	+ F	0 SP: S = H	Status equals
12. Voice	+ F	- SP: S < H	H dominance

cf) Speaker=S, Hearer=H

Appendix B

Questionnaire (Discourse Completion Task)

Instruction:

The following is a questionnaire to examine how you perform requests in an American university setting. Please read the description of each situation carefully and write down in English what you would say in a given situation. Because this is not a test or a measure of your language skills, there is absolutely no correct or wrong answer to each situation. Please write down everything that you would say in the situation. Even if you have not had experience in a particular situation, please imagine yourself in that situation and write down what you would be most likely to say.

Situation 1)
As a part-time job, you are working as a computer assistant in a computer lab. It is the end of the semester, and there are many students waiting for their turn to use computers. While consulting one student problems, you see your classmate playing games excitedly. Academic use always precedes non-academic use in a computer lab. You approach him/her. What would you say?

Situation 2)
You are taking a course. Last week you missed a few classes since you had a bad cold. A mid-term exam is scheduled to be held next week. You know that one of the classmates attends classes regularly and takes good notes. You want to borrow his/her notebook. You approach him/her. What would you say?

Situation 3)
Tomorrow is the due date of a final term paper for one of the courses you take this semester. However, you are not able to turn it in on time. You want to talk to the professor, whom you have known for a couple of years, and ask him/her to give you an extension on the paper. You go to his/her office and knock on the door. What would you say?

Situation 4)
As a part-time job, you are working as a library monitor. While checking on each floor in the library, you see a group of students that you don't know talking loudly in a non-discussion area. It seems clear that this loud noise disturbs other students' studying. You want those students to be quiet or move to a discussion area. You approach them. What would you say?

Situation 5)
You live in a dormitory. It about 12 o'clock midnight. You are preparing for a mid-term examination tomorrow. However, you can't concentrate on studying because you have been hearing loud music coming from a nearby room for more than an hour. You don't know the student who lives there. You want him/her to turn down the music. You go to his/her room. What would you say?

Situation 6)
You need to read an important article to write a final term paper. Today you have just found that a library does not have the scholarly journal which includes this article. You have heard that a new professor in your department has this article. Since you haven't had a chance to meet and talk with this professor before, you do not know him/her. You want to ask him/her to lend the article to you. You go to his/her office, and knock on the door. What would you say?

Situation 7)
You are the owner of a book store. Your shop clerk has worked for a year, and you have gotten to know him/her quite well. It is the beginning of the semester, and you are very busy selling and refunding textbooks all day. Today you have a plan to extend business hours by an hour, and you want to ask the clerk to stay after store hours. What would you say?

Situation 8)
You are typing a term paper on a computer. Suddenly, the computer breaks, and you don't know how to fix it. The paper should be submitted by tomorrow because the professor will be out of town for a while. You know that your close friend has the same computer you use. You want to ask him/her to let you use his/her computer for typing the paper. What would you say?

Situation 9)
You are looking for a book that you need to read for writing a term paper. Today you have just found that this book was checked out and recalled by another student, which means that you will have to wait for at least a month. You have about a week to write the paper. You know that your professor has this book. Because you have taken a course from this professor, you know him/her. You want to ask the professor to lend the book to you. You go to his/her office, and knock on the door. What would you say?

Situation 10)
You are a police officer. You see a car driving 50 miles an hour on campus, where the speed limit is 30 miles an hour. You stop the car and approach the driver, who seems to be a student. What would you say?

Situation 11)
For the first time this semester, you are taking a mathematics course. You have had a hard time following lectures and understanding the textbook. A test is scheduled to be held next week. You notice that one student sitting next to you seems to have a good background knowledge of math, and is doing well. Since it is the beginning of the semester, you do not know him/her yet. You want to ask him/her to study together for the upcoming test. What would you say?

Situation 12)
You are taking a course from a professor whom you have never seen before. Today is the first day of class. The professor talks about important things, such as textbooks, assignments and exams. Since a classroom is rather large and the professor speaks with a soft voice, you can't hear him/her well. What would you say?